REMARKS

Claims 16-22 and 81-94 are pending and are unamended. Claims 23-57 were canceled in this response. Claims 1-15 and 58-80 were canceled in the Preliminary Amendment.

Request for Interview Prior to Formal Action on Amendment

Applicants request an interview prior to formal action on this response. An "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form" accompanies this response. Please contact Applicants' undersigned representative to schedule the interview.

Election of Claims

Applicants elect Group I, claims 16-22. Applicants traverse the election because claims 81-94 are not independent and distinct from claims 16-22. Claims 81-87 recite an article of manufacture with the identical limitations as claims 16-22, as shown in the following DeltaView® document comparison between claims 16-22 and claims 81-87:

~~16. A computer-implemented method of~~81. An article of manufacture for creating a virtual traffic network, the article of manufacture comprising a computer-readable medium holding computer-executable instructions for performing a method comprising:
(a) inputting into a processor map data representing a road system, the road system being defined by a plurality of links;
(b) inputting into the processor flow data related to traffic flow on the road system;
(c) inputting into the processor traffic information about traffic events which are correlated to one or more of the links on the road system; and
(d) the processor integrating the map data, the flow data and the traffic information to produce a virtual traffic network representing traffic conditions on the road system.

~~17.~~82. The ~~method~~article of manufacture of claim ~~16~~81 wherein the flow data is real-time flow data, the virtual traffic network representing real-time traffic conditions on the road system.

~~18.~~83. The ~~method~~article of manufacture of claim ~~16~~81 wherein the flow

data is input from a plurality of road sensors.

~~19.~~84. The ~~method~~article of manufacture of claim ~~16~~81 wherein step (a) further comprises customizing the map data to define locally known features of the road system.

~~20.~~85. The ~~method~~article of manufacture of claim ~~16~~81 wherein the traffic information includes information related to one or more incidents on the road system.

~~21.~~86. The ~~method~~article of manufacture of claim ~~16~~81 wherein the map data, the flow data and the traffic information have a synaptic relationship with each other.

~~22.~~87. The ~~method~~article of manufacture of claim ~~16~~81 wherein the virtual traffic network is spatially oriented.

Likewise, claims 88-94 recite an apparatus with similar limitations as claims 16-22, as shown in the following DeltaView® document comparison between claims 16-22 and claims 88-94:

~~16.~~88. A computer-implemented ~~method of~~apparatus for creating a virtual traffic network comprising:
(a) means for inputting into a processor map data representing a road system, the road system being defined by a plurality of links;
(b) means for inputting into the processor flow data related to traffic flow on the road system;
(c) means for inputting into the processor traffic information about traffic events which are correlated to one or more of the links on the road system; and
(d) ~~the processor~~means for integrating the map data, the flow data and the traffic information to produce a virtual traffic network representing traffic conditions on the road system.

~~17.~~89. The ~~method~~apparatus of claim ~~16~~88 wherein the flow data is real-time flow data, the virtual traffic network representing real-time traffic conditions on the road system.

~~18.~~90. The ~~method~~apparatus of claim ~~16~~88 wherein the flow data is input from a plurality of road sensors.

~~19.~~91. The ~~method~~apparatus of claim ~~16~~88 wherein ~~step (a)~~the means for inputting into a processor map data representing a road system further comprises means for customizing the map data to define locally known

features of the road system.

~~20.~~92. The ~~method~~apparatus of claim ~~16~~88 wherein the traffic information includes information related to one or more incidents on the road system.

~~21.~~93. The ~~method~~apparatus of claim ~~16~~88 wherein the map data, the flow data and the traffic information have a synaptic relationship with each other.

~~22.~~94. The ~~method~~apparatus of claim ~~16~~88 wherein the virtual traffic network is spatially oriented.

Furthermore, the Examiner's proposed classification for claims 81-94, namely, class 707, subclass 2, is clearly incorrect. Class 707, subclass 2 is described in the class schedule as relating to " Subject matter directed to the retrieval of data stored in a database or as computer files, where a file is defined as a named collection of data," and more specifically, "subject matter directed to methods of access, including query path traversal, mapping, and reuse, joining tables in relational databases, view composition, index choice, bit mapping, and query reuse." In contrast, the classification of claims 16-22 is listed as being class 701, subclass 208, which is described in the class schedule as relating to "Navigation system[s] wherein the electrical data processing system or calculating computer functions to compute, establish, or indicate travel information associated with the distance measured from a present position to a terminating position," and more specifically, "Positioning determining equipment wherein the vehicle position information is utilized in conjunction with a map information processing data system."

Claims 81-94 clearly belong in the same class and subclass as claims 16-22. Claims 81-94 are directed to a navigation-related invention, not a generic database invention that would be more suitable for class 701, subclass 208.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that claims 81-94 be examined with the elected group of claims.

Species Election

Applicants traverse all of the species restrictions as being unclear and not relevant to the elected Group I. Accordingly, no species election can be made until additional clarification is provided as the species restrictions related to elected Group I.

The species rejection was given for the alleged reason that the species are independent and distinct because of the "patentably distinct embodiments in applicant's disclosure." Applicants traverse this explanation as being unclear and incomplete. No figures or examples are highlighted that correlate to the respective species. Many of the groupings of species relate to limitations recited in canceled claims, such as grouping B1-B3 (claims 23-33), C1-C4 (claims 34-43) , D1-D2 (claims 44-49), E1-E2 (claims 50-57). Furthermore, Applicants are unable to correlate the terminology used by the Examiner in defining the species with the claim limitations in the elected claims. Thus, if an election was made, it would be unclear as to exactly what is being elected.

For at least the reasons stated above, an election of species cannot be made, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the species restrictions.

Respectively submitted,

Brian Smyth *et al.*

Feb. 23, 2007 By: Clark Jablon
(Date)

CLARK A. JABLON
Registration No. 35,039
AKIN GUMP STRAUSS HAUER & FELD LLP
One Commerce Square
2005 Market Street, Suite 2200
Philadelphia, PA 19103-7013
Telephone: 215-965-1200
Direct Dial: 215-965-1293
Facsimile: 215-965-1210
E-Mail: cjablon@akingump.com